REMARKS

Claims 1-18 and 20 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objections and rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

The Specification has been objected to for an informality. The Abstract of the Disclosure has been amended to delete language referring to a "present invention." Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12, 15-18 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bala (US Patent App. 2004/0130572). The Examiner stated essentially that Bala teaches or suggests all the limitations of Claims 1-12, 15-18 and 20.

Claims 1 and 18 claim, *inter alia*, "recording at least one trace of at least one instance of a procedure, wherein the at least one trace comprises a plurality of steps; simultaneously performing an alignment and generalization of the plurality of steps, wherein the alignment identifies and aligns steps that are equivalent as generalized; and generating the one or more computer-executable procedures consistent with the alignment and generalization." Claim 20 claims, *inter alia*, "performing an alignment of a plurality of user actions of the at least one trace to at least a second trace to determine a plurality of aligned user actions, wherein the alignment identifies and aligns steps that are equivalent as generalized."

Bala teaches an authoring tool that monitors the actions an author performs on a computer and generates a script from it (see paragraph [0031]). Bala does not teach "simultaneously performing an alignment and generalization of the plurality of steps, wherein the alignment identifies and aligns steps that are equivalent as generalized" as claimed in Claims 1 and 18, nor

"performing an alignment of a plurality of user actions of the at least one trace to at least a second trace to determine a plurality of aligned user actions, wherein the alignment identifies and aligns steps that are equivalent as generalized" as claimed in Claim 20. Bala teaches a mere recording of actions performed by an author followed by editing. However, nowhere does Bala teach that editing includes either aligning or generalizing actions, much less an alignment that identifies and aligns steps that are equivalent as generalized, essentially as claimed. Bala is silent on alignment and generalization. Therefore, Bala fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 1, 18 and 20.

Claims 2-12, 15-17 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 18 and 20 has been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Horvitz (USPN 6,021,403). The Examiner stated essentially that Horvitz ('403) teaches all the limitations of Claims 1, 18 and 20.

Claims 1 and 18 claim, *inter alia*, "simultaneously performing an alignment and generalization of the plurality of steps, wherein the alignment identifies and aligns steps that are equivalent as generalized." Claim 20 claims, *inter alia*, "performing an alignment of a plurality of user actions of the at least one trace to at least a second trace to determine a plurality of aligned user actions, wherein the alignment identifies and aligns steps that are equivalent as generalized."

Horvitz ('403) teaches an event composing and monitoring system that allows high-level events to be created from combinations of low-level events (see Abstract). Horvitz ('403) does

not teach or suggest, "simultaneously performing an alignment and generalization of the plurality of steps, wherein the alignment identifies and aligns steps that are equivalent as generalized" as claimed in Claims 1 and 18, nor "performing an alignment of a plurality of user actions of the at least one trace to at least a second trace to determine a plurality of aligned user actions, wherein the alignment identifies and aligns steps that are equivalent as generalized" as claimed in Claim 20. Horvitz ('403) teaches inputting low-level events and producing high-level events (see FIG. 2). The construction of high-level events from low-level events is the opposite of generalization. Indeed, nowhere does Horvitz ('403) teach determining a low-level event from a high-level event. Therefore, Horvitz ('403) fails to teach all the limitations of Claims 1, 18 and 20.

The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bala in view of Horvitz (USPN 6,009,452). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Bala and Horvitz ('452) teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 13 and 14.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the present application, including Claims 1-18 and 20, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 26, 2007

/Nathaniel T. Wallace/
Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL.: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889